

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 22-32 are pending. No claims are amended by the instant paper.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 22, 23, 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Schmidt et al (U.S. Pat. 6,516,200). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 22 is drawn to a method of establishing a conference call, comprising the step of receiving input signals that comprise a conference code and a group code. The conference code indicates a subscriber's desire to establish a conference. The system automatically sets up a conference call in a conferencing bridge in response to the conference code. The group code indicates a group of participants for the conference call.

Schmidt does not appear to teach setting up a conferencing call in a conferencing bridge in response to receiving a conference code. Schmidt is directed to cellular telephones, and more specifically, to cellular radio telephones, which do not require the same extent of resource allocation, as does the presently claimed method. Schmidt, col. 3, ll. 15-25. Consequently, Schmidt only requires a user group identification number to initiate a group call (col. 7, ll. 54-56) and does not require a conference code to prompt the system to allocate resources, i.e., to set up a conference call in a conferencing bridge.

The Examiner contends that Schmidt teaches a conference code and group code at column 7, lines 54-60 and column 9, lines 17-25, 31-37. However, these sections do not appear to teach setting up a conference call in a conferencing bridge. These sections appear to refer only to a group identification number, i.e., a group code. The "*12" in this section appears to only prompt the system to decide which group of people to call and does not appear to prompt the system to set up a conference call in a conferencing bridge. As indicated above, it does not appear that Schmidt utilizes a conferencing bridge.

We note that Schmidt does refer to "flags," which are characters such as * and # that precede a group code. These flags do not appear to prompt the system to set up a conference call in a conferencing bridge. Rather, the flags apparently denote a priority level of the group call and prompt group members receiving terminals of the group call whether or not to automatically answer the call. Cols. 8 and 9.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 24-26, 33, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt et al (U.S. Pat. 6,516,200). The rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claims 24-26, 33, and 34 are dependent from independent claim 22. As discussed above, Schmidt does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 22; therefore, claim 22 and its dependent claims are not obvious in view of Schmidt. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 24-26, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are allowable, and requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued for these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

11/11/05

Date



Raymond S. Reese
Registration No. 47,891

Customer No. 29855
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,
RUTENFORD & BRUCCOLERI, LLP
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070